DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 244 SO 010 527

AUTHOR Davis, Margaret R.; Cancian, Francesca M.
TITLE The Effects of Roles, Actions and Situations on Social Identity.
PUB DATE Sep 77
NOTE 30p.; Revision of a paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (Chicago, Illinois, September 5-9, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior; Behavioral Science Research; Employer Employee Relationship; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Relationship; Literature Reviews; Parent Role; *Personality; Research Methodology; *Role Perception; Sex Role; *Social Behavior; Social Factors; *Sociology; Statistical Analysis; Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT

This study examines the effects of social roles, types of action, and concrete situations on people's conceptions of others. In this study, 180 college students were given questionnaires containing short descriptions of interactions between an adult and an adolescent boy. These questionnaires were designed to examine the effects of two role sets (female-male and employer-parent), two types of action (task-oriented or expressing emotion) and several concrete situations on three dependent variables: (a) predicted behavior for the adult in each hypothetical situation, (b) selection of most relevant attributes of the adult's personality, and (c) ratings of the adults on several personality attributes. Adults were depicted as employers or parents of the boy, and their actions were either task-oriented or expressively affective. Students were asked to predict the adults' behavior in certain situations, and to identify personal characteristics of the adults in situations where their behavior was already described. Characteristics included terms such as "businesslike" and "loyal and supportive." Results showed that predictions of behavior are strongly influenced by the parent-employer role set, but not by the sex of the hypothetical adult. Personality ratings are determined primarily by actions, not by role. (Author/AV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED151244

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

DEC 12

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Francesca Cancian

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

The Effects of Roles, Actions and Situations on Social Identity*

Margaret R. Davis
Stanford University

and

Francesca M. Cancian
Univ. of California, Irvine

*Revision of paper presented at annual meetings of American Sociological Association, Chicago, Illinois, September, 1977. We would like to thank Nancy Tuma, C. Norman Alexander, Jr., Patricia R. Barchas, Anne M. McMahon, and Barbara Sobieszek for their help and suggestions.

September, 1977

SP 010 527

The Effects of Roles, Actions and Situations on Social Identity

Many scientists assume that human society depends on shared meaning. That is, coordinated actions and complex social organizations require, among other things, that people involved have a similar definition of the situation and agree on each other's social identity. Given this perspective, we are led to ask the following questions: How do people arrive at a shared definition of the situation? What cues determine people's conception of someone's character or social identity?

Previous research has developed two approaches to explaining shared meaning. The first is the structural-cultural approach that focuses on social roles, institutions, cultural norms and typifications. The second is the situational approach, that focuses on how consensus emerges from a specific sequence of events in a particular setting. The research described in this paper lends support to both approaches. In particular, the results of our questionnaire study indicate that simply knowing a person's social role--for example, knowing the person is a parent rather than an employer--generates shared expectations about how he or she will behave. However, once the person acts, then it seems actions are more important than role in determining the shared impressions that others have of the actor.

In the following sections, we discuss the previous research that has formed the basis of this study. We then present our methods and describe the major findings.

Previous Research

Social psychologists have done extensive research on how situations and action affect social identity (Hastorf, 1970). They have also examined the effects of social roles (Sarbin and Allen, 1968). However, the combined effects of these three factors have not been investigated.

In the past decade, there have been many studies on attribution theory and person perception that have investigated the conditions under which people attribute causality, intention and other dispositions to others (Jones and Davis, 1965; Kelley, 1967). For example, the correspondent inferences theory of Jones and Davis leads us to expect that the more "out of role" a particular exhibited trait is, the more certainty people have in making a personality inference about the actor. If an employer is depicted as businesslike, this tells us less about his personality than if a mother is businesslike; for in our society, employers are "supposed" to be businesslike and mothers are not. There has also been considerable research on the "demand characteristics" of experiments, that has shown how the responses of subjects are affected by the meanings attributed to the experimenter's actions (Rosenthal, 1966; Orne, 1967). However, as Alexander and Sagatun (1973) have pointed out, much of this work has been psychologically oriented and has tended to obscure the impact of social norms and shared definitions of the situation.

The research of Norman Alexander and his associates on situated identity focuses on the meaning of particular situations (Alexander and Weil, 1969; (Alexander and Knight, 1971; Alexander and Lauderdale, 1972; Alexander and Sagatun, 1973). They define situated identity as "the dispositional imputations about an individual that are conveyed by his actions in a particular social context" (Alexander and Knight, 1971:65). In a series of simulated replications of famous psychological experiments, Alexander et al. have shown that respondents who act as "outside observers" of these experimental situations exhibit clear consensus both as to predicting the actions of experimental subjects and as to the identity implications for such subjects. In all these studies, behaviors predicted by respondents in the simulations closely parallel the results of the original experiments, suggesting that both actual and simulation subjects are

relying on the same cues in choosing behavioral responses. Since the respondents do not communicate with each other, obviously this consensus cannot have emerged during the studies. Respondents must previously have acquired the capacity to generate consensual interpretations of the meaning of the situation. It seems to us that the only process by which individuals can independently and consistently arrive at the same interpretation is if they have previously learned to use the same general criteria in generating interpretations--for example, the same norms, or role expectations, or cultural typology of situations.

In the present study, we have attempted to develop (1) a means for measuring the separate impact of social roles and kinds of action on people's expectations of others' behaviors and on identity implications for the actors; and (2) general typologies of attributes and of action alternatives which would enable us to determine whether a certain role or type of action might produce similar "identities" across different situations.

Specifically, we are trying to determine: (1) What is the relative impact of role and of situation in predicting the behavior of another person? (2) Can the consensus among respondents on the meaning of particular situations (in particular, on the identity implications of alternative actions) be explained by general cultural understandings such as role expectations? (3) What is the relative impact of role, situation and action on the characteristics that are attributed to another person?

Procedure

Our overall strategy was to use the expressive-instrumental distinction[1] to describe types of roles, actions and attributes. Our general hypothesis was that there would be a consistent relationship among variables on the basis of this distinction. For example, we felt that respondents would expect people in

the instrumental roles of employers or males to act in task-oriented ways and to have attributes like being forceful and self-confident. On the other hand, people in the expressive roles of parents or females would be expected to act affectively and have attributes like tender and softhearted. This general hypothesis was confirmed in most respects, but there were also some major surprises.

Our specific method was to design several versions of a questionnaire in order to manipulate our variables of interest. Subjects were 180 male and female undergraduate students in several introductory social science classes at Stanford University in spring, 1973.

The first part of our research was designed to examine how social roles and specific situations affect people's expectations about how a person will behave. To do this, we presented respondents with questionnaires that briefly described five situations in which an adult is depicted as interacting with an adolescent boy. We ended the description of each situation with two alternative actions that the adult could take, and asked respondents to predict which action actually would be taken. In each situation, one action alternative was expressive, or particularistic; the other was instrumental, or universalistic. In order to control for the effects of the positive-negative dimension, in some situations, the expressive action was most positive or desirable from the boy's point of view; in others, the instrumental action was more positive. The situations are listed on Figure 1.[2]

Figure 1 about here

We examined the effects of two role sets on the respondents' predictions of behavior in these five situations: (a) female-male and (b) parent-employer.

Our rationale for this choice was that these roles are theoretically interesting and seem to affect interaction over a wide range of situations. The importance of family/gemeinschaft/expressiveness as contrasted to work/gesellschaft/instrumentality in organizing social relations has been one of the basic points of social theory for the past century, from Marx to Weber to Parsons. These theories are empirically supported by Triandis' research on perceptions of similarity among identities or roles (Triandis et al., 1968).

Sex also seems to have a pervasive influence across particular situations. In additon, sex roles have been linked to the expressive-instrumental dimension by many sociologists (Parsons and Bales, 1955). In a classic theoretical paper, Everett Hughes discussed sex as a striking illustration in our society of a "master status"--that is, a status that is strongly associated with "characteristic patterns of expected personal attributes and a way of life" (1945:353). There is abundant evidence that supports this position and shows that actions, expectations and evaluations vary by sex over a wide range of situations (Maccoby and Jacklin, 1974).

In order to examine the effects of these social roles, different questionnaires contained a random mixture of four different situation versions depicting the adult as either (1) male employer, or (2) female employer, or (3) male parent, or (4) female parent. In part I of our study, four groups of 15 students each, randomly received one of the four versions and were asked to predict which action the adult in each situation would take. Insofar as social roles determine social identities, one would expect respondents to predict that females and parents would select the expressive action, while males and employers would select the instrumental action. Insofar as the specific situation determines social identities, one would expect the predictions for a particular role to vary considerably, across the five situations.

While the first part of our study focused on behavior predictions, the second part examined two other aspects of social identity: (a) what attributes are most relevant in forming an impression of the adult, and (b) how the adult is rated on a series of attributes. (Both parts of the study are based on the methods developed by Alexander.)

In the second part of the study, we used the same five situations, only this time the respondents were told what action the adult had taken: in some versions of the questionnaire, the adult was described as taking the expressive action; in other versions, the adult took the instrumental action. There were thus eight versions of each situation: four types of role times two types of action. These were randomly distributed to an additional 120 subjects. (See Figure 2 for summary of experimental conditions.)

Figure 2 about here

Respondents were asked: (1) to select 3 attributes from a list of 11 that they felt were most important in forming an impression of the adult in each situation, and (2) to rate the adult on each of the 11 attributes. The list of attributes includes 6 instrumental traits, such as "self-confident" and "business-like," and 5 expressive traits, such as "loyal and supportive." The list was based on previous research by Leary, Triandis and others on the basic dimensions of social perception.(3)

In this second part of the study, insofar as social roles determine social identities, we would expect respondents to select expressive attributes as most relevant when the adult in the situation is a woman or a parent. We would also expect women and parents to receive higher ratings on expressive attributes than men and employers. Insofar as actions determine social identities, we would expect

respondents to select expressive attributes and give high ratings on expressiveness when the adult acted expressively, regardless of the adult's sex or kin relation to the boy. Finally, according to Alexander's situated identity theory, the selection of relevant attributes, and the attribute rating, should be consistent with the behavior prediction data. If, for example, parents are expected to behave differently from employers, this is because the same actions have different identity implications for them (as evidenced by attributes seen as relevant to describe them).

In sum, the independent variables in our study were role, action and situation. The three dependent variables were behavior predictions, relevant attributes selected and attribute ratings.

Results

A. Behavior Predictions. Table 1 presents the results of the first part of our study on the effects of role and situation on behavior predictions.

Table 1 about here

As we expected, respondents are far more likely to predict that parents, but not employers, will choose the expressive alternative ($\chi^2 = 29.67$, 1 d.f., $p < .001$). It is interesting to note that in Situation 3, where parents are placed in the role of employer, the effect disappears completely. Clearly, to our respondents, parents who employ their children are not expected to act more expressively than would a non-parent employer in a similar situation.

Contrary to our expectations, there is no sex-role effect ($\chi^2 = .132$, 1 d.f., n.s.). Mothers and female employers on the whole are not more likely than fathers and male employers to choose the expressive alternative. Differences among the five situations are not significant ($\chi^2 = 7.88$, 4 d.f., $p = .10$).

B. Selection of Relevant Attributes. Secondly, we examined the impact of role, action and situation on the attributes selected as most relevant to describe the adult. (It may be recalled that these data were gathered in Part II of our study, where questionnaires stated which action the adult had actually taken in each situation.)

To test our hypotheses, we performed a multiple regression analysis on our data. The standardized regression coefficients (betas) reported in Table 2 enable us to examine the relative impact of every independent variable on the selection of expressive attributes as relevant.(4)

Table 2 about here

In Table 2, there is a significant negative effect for Employer, as we expected, meaning that respondents are significantly less likely to choose expressive attributes as most relevant when the adult is portrayed as an employer rather than as a parent. Also as we expected, instrumental actions are negatively related to selection of expressive attributes; the same is true of negative actions. The small beta shown for Female indicates that sex has no bearing on the selection of expressive attributes as most relevant. Although this last finding is contrary to our initial expectation, it is certainly consistent with Alexander's situated identity theory which would predict that the absence of sex effects in the behavior predictions (see Table 1) would result in a corresponding absence of sex effects in the selection of relevant attributes.

All of the situation variables had significant effects.(5) Interaction effects were not significant and are not shown in the table.

In sum, it appears from these findings that the type of action taken (instrumental-expressive and negative-positive) radically changes the meaning of the situation. Similarly, the employer-parent role has a clear impact on the identity implications of the situation. Sex has no effect. The strong situation effects certainly support Alexander's emphasis on the unique meaning of each situation. Furthermore, it is interesting that in the one situation which most clearly differs from the others in terms of role (that is, Situation 3 where parents are cast as employers), the situation effect is strongest--that is, there is strongest consensus amongst respondents that expressive attributes are not relevant.

C. Ratings on Attributes. For this part of our study, respondents were told the action actually taken by the adult and were asked to rate the adult on a set of attributes. We analyze and present separately the results for ratings on expressive attributes and on instrumental attributes, as these are not mutually exclusive, and it is quite possible for there to be high (or low) ratings on both.

(i) Expressiveness ratings.

The regression analysis presented in Table 3 shows the effects of role, action and situation on expressiveness ratings. Clearly, actions produce the most significant effects. As we predicted, both instrumental and negative actions produce significantly lower ratings on expressive attributes than do expressive or positive actions. Females are more likely than males to get high ratings (although the effect is nowhere near as strong as for actions). The employer-parent role does not have an effect.

Table 3 about here

The only situation showing a significant effect is Situation 4. This is the situation where the adolescent is being sullen, and the adult either speaks to him about it, or leaves him alone. Perhaps this situation has a positive effect on expressive ratings because either action alternative can be interpreted as acting out of concern for the boy's feelings. In all, our model is a fairly powerful predictor of expressive ratings (R^2 = .53, indicating that 53% of the variance on the dependent variable can be accounted for by the independent variables we have included in the regression equation). Interaction effects are non-significant.

(ii) Instrumental ratings.

The results concerning instrumental ratings are more complex in two important ways. First, when we examined the mean ratings by role, action and situation as shown in Table 4, we discovered there were two completely different patterns of instrumental ratings.

Table 4 about here

As Table 4 shows, in Situations 1, 3 and 5, instrumental action results in high instrumental ratings, as predicted; but for Situations 2 and 4, instrumental action unexpectedly produces lower instrumental ratings. Our post hoc explanation is that situations 2 and 4 may be distinctive because in these cases the action we have defined as instrumental consists of "doing nothing"--that is, saying nothing to an upset or sullen boy. Perhaps there is an active-passive dimension to behavior which sometimes eliminates the effects of the instrumental-expressive dimension so that when one action alternative is passive, being active (rather than instrumental) is what elicits high ratings on instrumental attributes.

Accordingly, we performed two regression analyses on these data: one including data for Situations 1, 3 and 5 only; and one including data for Situations 2 and 4 only. The results appear in Table 5.

Table 5 about here

Table 5A (left-hand side) illustrates dramatically the difference in effect of instrumental action on instrumental ratings in the two kinds of situation. For Situations 1, 3 and 5--where the instrumental action is "active"--there is a strong positive relationship. For Situations 2 and 4, however--where the instrumental action is "passive"--there is a significant negative relationship. As predicted, negative actions bring higher instrumental ratings for all situations; sex is not significant in any. The employer-parent role is important for Situations 2 and 4 only, where the large beta tells us that employers in these two situations are rated as more instrumental than parents, no matter what action they are portrayed as taking. This effect is lost, however, in the other three situations. Situation effect is strongest for Situation 4; as already mentioned, in this situation, either action might have been interpreted as showing concern for the boy, which would account for the significantly lower rating on instrumental traits than the other situations.

A second way in which the instrumental ratings were unexpectedly complicated was that there were several significant interaction effects. Table 5B (right-hand side) shows the results of including interaction terms in the regression equations. (Although we examined the effects of all possible interactions, only significant effects are shown in the table.)

For Situations 1, 3 and 5, two interaction effects are significant: "Instrumental Action-Female" and "Instrumental Action-Employer." It may be seen that

when "Instrumental Action-Female" is included in the equation, the negative effect for Female increases (from -.06 to -.14), implying that females whose actions are expressive are especially likely to receive low instrumental ratings (beyond the simple additive effects of Female and Expressive Action).

Similarly, when "Instrumental Action-Employer" is included in the equation, the small beta for Employer becomes significantly negative, indicating that employers whose actions are expressive are especially likely to receive low instrumental ratings (beyond the additive effects of Employer and Instrumental Action). Thirdly, when the two interaction terms of "Instrumental Action-Female" and "Instrumental Action-Employer" are included, the large positive beta for Instrumental Action becomes smaller (decreasing from .38 to .18), again indicating the disproportionate influence of these two kinds of instrumental actors on instrumental ratings.(6)

In other words, when females act "out of role" (by being instrumental), they receive especially high instrumental ratings; similarly, when employers act "out of role" (by being expressive), they receive especially low instrumental ratings.

For Situations 2 and 4, it may be seen that when the interaction term for "Female-Employer" is included in the equation, the beta for Female--which now represents the effect of female parents--becomes significantly negative, indicating that mothers are especially likely to get lower instrumental ratings than female employers (beyond the additive effects of Female and Employer). Similarly, it seems that female employers were contributing a disproportionate share of the large positive effect of Employer on instrumental ratings (.10) as this effect drops (to -.06) when the interaction term is included in the equation. It is not clear whether being a female and being an employer is another instance of "acting out of role." It seems, however, that most of these findings concerning

interaction effects can be explained by "correspondence theory" which predicts that behavior contrary to normative expectations leads observers to make stronger inferences of personality.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the results of this exploratory study indicate that both structural and situational factors appear to affect shared definitions of social identities. (1) Predictions of behavior were affected primarily by the employer-parent role, and not by the specific situation. (2) In the selection of relevant attributes, the adult's action had the strongest effects; however, role (employer-parent) and specific situation also had significant, although smaller, effects. (3) In the attribute ratings, the effects of action clearly overwhelmed any effects of role or situation. It seems that once an action occurs, the impressions that people form of an actor will depend more on what he or she does than on who he or she is.

This line of reasoning explains some of the puzzling findings on the effects of roles. Given the strong effect of the parent-employer role on behavior predictions, we were surprised that this role-set had relatively weak effects on the attribute ratings. It would seem that, in the absence of other information, respondents make their predictions on the basis of these normative role expectations; but, when a person's action is known, this information take precedence in forming impressions of the actor.

Clearly, our study raises more questions than it answers. It would appear, for example, that at least in the situations we have studied, the active-passive dimension of action is just as relevant to ratings on instrumental attributes as is the instrumental-expressive dimension.

Finally, our most puzzling finding is the virtual absence of sex-role effects. Perhaps sex roles were not salient in the specific situations we studied. Sex may be most important in situations where the relative power or status of two people is negotiable, or where there is a conflict between work and family responsibilities. In all our situations, the adult had clear, non-negotiable authority over the boy on the basis of age and role; and no situation involved a conflict between work and family. Further research is needed to examine different types of situations and identify the conditions under which sex roles are salient.

Figure 1

Examples of Situations Used in the Questionnaires

There are four versions of each situation: Male Parent, Female Parent, Male Employer, Female Employer. These are systematically varied among questionnaires. Where sex of adult is changed, "Mr." becomes "Mrs.," "father" becomes "mother," and so on. For the adult-employer manipulation, the words underlined in the examples below were changed to the alternative version in parentheses following each situation.

Expressive and Positive Actions vs. Instrumental and Negative Actions

1. Mrs. Anthony has been asked by her son, Bob, to attend a play in which Bob has a bit part. Mrs. Anthony has been planning to spend the evening of the play checking her bank statement. Does she: (p) decide to attend the play anyway? (u) tell Bob that she is too busy to attend the play? (..store clerk, Bob..)

2. Mr. Alberts sees that Joe, who works in his coffee shop, is very quiet and seems upset about something. Mr. Alberts is very busy, as he has a lot of work to get through that morning. Does he: (p) interrupt his work to ask Joe what is wrong? (u) continue working and say nothing to Joe? (..his son, Joe..)

5. Mr. Martin wants to hire someone to lay tile in the family room. His young son, Bob, has had a little experience in tile-laying and would very much like the job. However, Mr. Martin knows of another boy who would be far more capable. Does he: (p) hire Bob? (u) hire the other boy? (..his store...clerk..)

Expressive and Negative Actions vs. Instrumental and Negative Actions

3. Mrs. Barker hires two brothers to be stockroom clerks, paying them both exactly the same hourly wage. After a few weeks, it is obvious that one of them--Jim--is a much quicker and more efficient worker than the other. Jim feels that it is unfair that they should be paid the same wage, and asks

Mrs. Barker for a raise. Mrs. Barker agrees that Jim is a better worker. Does she: (p) continue to pay both clerks the same wage? (u) give Jim a raise? (...her two sons to perform regular chores around the house and yard..boys..)

4. Alec, for no apparent reason, is in an extremely bad mood. He is working as a messenger in an office, and as the day wears on, he is increasingly sarcastic and unpleasant with Mr. Kennedy, the office manager. Does Mr. Kennedy: (p) speak to him about it? (u) say nothing? (..As the day wears on, ...his father...his father...)

Note that in Situation 3, both parents and employers are cast in the role of regular employer. This is in contrast to Situation 5, for example, where the tile-laying job is more in the nature of a "favor" that may be granted or withheld by the adult, rather than being part of regular employment.

Figure 2

Summary of Experimental Conditions

Part I - Behavior Predictions

Situation	Situation 1 ----*			
Employer-Parent:	Employer		Parent	
Sex	Male	Female	Male	Female
	n=15	n=15	n=15	n=15

Part II - Selection of Relevant Attributes and Attribute Ratings

Situation	Situation 1 ----*							
Employer-Parent	Employer				Parent			
Sex	Male		Female		Male		Female	
Action	Exp.	Inst.	Exp.	Inst.	Exp.	Inst.	Exp.	Inst.
	n=15	n=15	n=15	n=15	n=15	n=15	n=15	n=15

*These same conditions were manipulated for the remaining seven situations also.

There were four questionnaire versions at Part I; eight at Part II. Experimental conditions were systematically varied in all situations across the different versions.

Table 1

Number of Respondents' Predicting That Adult Will Behave Expressively

Situation	Parents		Employers	
	Mother	Father	Female	Male
Expressive-Positive Action	%	%	%	%
1. Go to play	93	87	40	33
2. Comfort upset	87	73	53	60
5. Hire incompetent	73	80	40	40
Expressive-Negative Action				
3. No raise to brother	67	47	53	60
4. Inquire about sullenness	93	100	60	60

*15 respondents predicted the actions of each type of adult in each situation; thus this is the maximum number for each cell.

Table 2

Effects of Role, Action and Situation on Selection of Expressive Traits as Most Relevant

	Beta[1]	F
Role		
Female	.01	.10
Employer	-.14	16.40**
Action		
Instrumental	-.26	54.74**
Negative	-.22	39.12**
Situation[2]		
1. Go to play	.10	4.98*
2. Comfort upset	.12	7.34**
3. No raise to brother	-.32	55.54**
4. Inquire about sullenness	-.11	6.52*

$R^2 = .32$

$N = 600$[3]

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

(1) Beta refers to standardized regression coefficient. All independent variables are dummy (0-1) variables; e.g., sex role is given a value of 1 if female, 0 if male.

(2) Situation 5 was omitted for the regression equation and acts as a comparison base.

(3) Each subject's response to each situation was treated as a separate case. Although there may be some inclination of subjects to give the same response across situations, our research design has ensured that responses cannot be correlated with any combination of independent variables.

Table 3

Effects of Role, Action and Situation on Expressive Ratings[1]

	Beta[2]	F
Role		
Female	.07	6.18*
Employer	.00	.00
Action		
Instrumental	-.50	299.90**
Negative	-.41	203.74**
Situation[2]		
1. Go to play	-.05	1.89
2. Comfort upset	.00	.00
3. No raise to brother	.00	.00
4. Inquire about sullenness	.11	9.60**

$R^2 = .53$

$N = 596$[2]

* p .05

** p .01

(1) The measure for expressive ratings is the sum of the ratings (1 to 7) on each of the five attributes in the expressive scale.

(2) Refer to footnotes on Table 2 regarding beta, situation and N.

Table 4

Mean Rating on Instrumental Attributes by Role, Action and Situation

Situations

	Instrumental Action is "Active"						Instrumental Action is "Passive"			
	1		3		5		2		4	
	Exp. Action	Inst. Action	Exp. Action	Inst. Action	Exp. Action	Inst. Action	Exp. Action	Inst. Action	Exp. Action	Inst. Action
Mother	4.1	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.1	5.4	4.7	3.7	4.6	3.3
Father	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.9	4.4	4.9	5.0	4.3	4.8	3.3
Female Employer	4.1	5.1	4.0	4.7	3.7	5.6	4.8	4.3	5.4	3.8
Male Employer	4.6	5.5	4.4	4.7	3.9	5.4	5.2	4.0	5.0	3.1

Table 5

Effects of Role, Action and Situation on Instrumental Ratings (1)

	A. Main Effects Only				B. Interaction Effects Included			
	Sits. 1, 3, 5. (Inst. Action is "Active")		Sits. 2,4 (Inst. Action is "Passive")		Sits. 1, 3, 5. (Inst. Action is "Active")		Sits. 2,4 (Inst. Action is "Passive")	
	Beta (2)	F	Beta (2)	F	Beta (2)	F	Beta (2)	F
Role								
Female	-.06	1.51	-.02	0.13	-.14	2.60	-.19	3.97*
Employer	-.02	0.12	.10	4.14*	-.17	4.06*	-.06	0.37
Action								
Instrumental	.38	60.12**	-.60	155.24**	.18	4.55*	-.60	53.99**
Negative	.19	14.85**	.25	27.27**	.10	1.52	.20	5.85*
Situation (2)								
1. Go to play	.01	0.08	—	—	.02	0.08	—	—
2. Comfort upset	—	—	.18	12.95**	—	—	.18	13.16**
3. No raise to brother	-.05	0.94	—	—	-.05	0.95	—	—
4. Inquire about sullenness	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Interactions								
Female-Employer	—	—	—	—	N.S.	N.S.	.23	7.90
Inst. Action-- Female	—	—	—	—	.17	4.18*	N.S.	N.S.
Inst. Action-- Employer	—	—	—	—	.18	4.39*	N.S.	N.S.
	R^2= .24 N = 359 (2)		R^2= .46 N = 241 (2)		R^2= .28 N = 359 (2)		R^2= .48 N = 241 (2)	

*p < .05 **p < .01

(1) The measure for instrumental ratings is the sum of the ratings (1 to 7) on each of the six attributes in the instrumental scale.

(2) Refer to footnotes in Table 2 regarding Beta, Situation, and N.

Footnotes

(1) Following Parsons and Bales (1955) and others, we are using "instrumental vs. expressive" to refer to task orientation vs. socio-emotional orientation; or affectively neutral, specific, universalistic, achievement orientations vs. affective, diffuse, particularistic or achievement orientations.

(2) The situations were chosen from a list of twenty that were pretested on fifty subjects. The main criteria for selecting situations were: (1) it made "cultural sense" for each of the four types of adult to be in that situation; (2) there was a fairly even distribution of behavior predictions across the two action alternatives, disregarding role; (3) one action alternative was clearly instrumental and the other expressive.

(3) The instrumental attributes were: "competent," "forceful," "self-confident," "businesslike," "firm but just," "straightforward and direct." The expressive attributes were: "loyal and supportive," "enjoys taking care of others," "tender and softhearted," "warm and understanding," "eager to get along with others." Among instrumental attributes, there were the following intercorrelations: four of .6 or higher, three of .5, five of .4, five of .3. Among expressive attributes, there were four of .7 or higher, five of .6, one of .5.

(4) Attributes selected as most relevant have to be <u>either</u> expressive <u>or</u> instrumental. This table shows only expressive attributes chosen; but we know that a high negative beta here means that there is a high <u>positive</u> relationship between the independent variable and <u>instrumental</u> attributes chosen as most relevant.

(5) Amongst the situation variables, in an analysis such as this, we are obliged to omit at least one situation from the regression equation. The

omitted situation acts as a comparison base; hence, in Table 2, we can say that in comparison to Situation 5, in both Situations 1 and 2 expressive attributes are significantly more likely to be chosen as relevant; in Situations 3 and 4, they will be chosen less often.

(6) The results of decomposing the interaction effects of role and instrumental action on instrumental ratings are shown below.

Inst. Act-Female	Inst. Act-Male
2.52	1.34
Exp. Act-Female	Exp. Act-Male
-1.98	0

Inst. Act-Employer	Inst. Act-Parent
3.27	1.34
Exp. Act-Employer	Exp. Act-Parent
-1.84	0

(Expressive action - male and expressive action - parent are the comparison base for each set.)

References

Alexander, C. Norman and Inger Sagatun

1973 "An attributional analysis of experimental norms." Sociometry 36 2:127-142.

Alexander, C. Norman and Patrick Lauderdale

1972 "Situated identity theory and the definition of social reality." Unpublished paper, Stanford University.

Alexander, C. Norman and Gordon W. Knight

1971 "Situated identities and social psychological experimentation." Sociometry 34 (March) 65-82.

1972 "Situated identity formation in response to persuasive communications." Unpublished paper, Stanford University.

Alexander, C. Norman and Harrison G. Weil

1961 "Players, persons, and purposes: Situational meaning and the Prisoner's Dilemma game." Sociometry 32 (June):121-144.

Hastorf, Albert H., David J. Schneider and Judith Polefka

1970 Person Perception. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

Hughes, Everett C.

1945 "Dilemmas and contradictions of status." American Journal of Sociology (1945) 353-359.

Jones, Edward E. and Keith Davis

1965 "From acts to dispositions." Pp. 219-265 in L. Berkowitz (ed.) Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. II. New York: Academic Press.

Kelley, Harold H.

1957 "Attribution theory in social psychology." Pp. 192-238 in David Levine (ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.

Leary, Timothy

1957 Interpersonal Diagnoses of Personality. New York, Ronald Press.

Leary, Timothy and H. Coffey

1954 "The prediction of interpersonal behavior in group psychotherapy." Group Psychotherapy 7, No. 1.

1955 "Interpersonal diagnosis." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 50:110-124.

Maccoby, Eleanor and Carol Jacklin

1974 The Psychology of Sex Differences. Stanford University Press.

Orne, Martin T.

1969 "Demand characteristics and the concept of quasi-controls." Pp. 143-179 in R. Rosenthal and R. L. Rosnow (eds.) Artifact in Behavioral Research. New York: Academic Press.

Parsons, Talcott

1951 The Social System. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.

Parsons Talcott and Robert Bales.

1955 Family, Socialization and Interaction Process. Glencoe, Ill. Free Press.

Rosenthal, Robert

1966 Experimenter Effects in Behavioral Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Sarbin, Theodore and Vernon L. Allen

1968 "Role theory." Pp. 488-567 in G. Lindsey and E. Aronson (eds.) Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. I. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

Triandis, Harry, V. Vassiliou and M. Nassiakou

1968 "The Cross-Cultural Study of Subjective Culture." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Monograph Supplement 8, pp. 1-42.